

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CMs-4138-40-CI-2017; and
RFA No.3933 of 1992(O&M)
Date of decision: 01.09.2017

Dharmo Devi

... Appellants

Versus

Land Acquisition Collector, Sub Divisional Officer-cum-Land Acquisition
Collector, Pathankot and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. RS Manhas, Advocate for the appellants.

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

CMs-4138-39-CI-2017

Allowed as prayed for.

CM-4140-CI-2017

This is an application seeking restoration of the CM Nos.298 to 300-CI of 2016, that were dismissed by this Court for default of appearance and non-prosecution on 22.01.2016.

Notice.

Ms. Aakriti, Advocate for Ms. Ranjana Shahi, Senior Counsel for UOI, present in court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

For the reasons set out in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, the order dated 22.01.2016 is re-called and CM Nos.298 to 300-CI of 2016 are restored to their original numbers.

CM-299-CI-2016

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 970 days in moving the application for restoration of the accompanying appeal.

For the reasons set out in the application, the delay that has occurred in filing the application for restoration of the appeal is condoned.

CM stands disposed.

CM-300-CI-2016

This is an application seeking restoration of the accompanying appeal that was dismissed for non-prosecution on 21.02.2013.

For the reasons set out in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, the order dated 21.02.2013 is re-called and the appeal is restored to its original number.

RFA No.3933 of 1992

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the matter in issue is squarely covered by order and judgment, dated 27.05.2015, rendered by this court in RFA No.3483 of 1992 [**Union of India and others v. Raghbir Singh and others**] and other connected cases, vide which the appeals, arising out of the same acquisition, preferred by the Union of India, were dismissed, whereas the appeals filed by the claimant-land owners were allowed. Consequently, the compensation was enhanced to ₹ 1000/- per marla. Accordingly, it is urged that the present appeal too be disposed of in terms of the decision rendered by this Court in Raghbir Singh's case (supra).

Ordered, accordingly.

September 1, 2017
Rajan

(**Arun Palli**)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO